

**THE VARIATIONAL PRINCIPLE**

We introduced in chapter 3 the topological entropy  $h(T)$  of a continuous map  $T : X \rightarrow X$  of a compact metric space  $X$  and in chapter 8 the entropy  $h_\mu(T)$  of a  $T$ -invariant probability measure  $\mu$ . In this chapter we show that these two notions are closely related.

**14.1 The variational principle for entropy**

The main result of this chapter is the following.

**THEOREM 14.1 (VARIATIONAL PRINCIPLE).** *Let  $T : X \rightarrow X$  be a continuous map on a compact metric space.*

- (1) *For any  $T$ -invariant probability measure  $\mu$  we have that  $h_\mu(T) \leq h(T)$ .*
- (2)  $h(T) = \sup\{h_\mu(T) : \mu \text{ is a } T\text{-invariant probability measure}\}$ .

**14.2 The proof of the variational principle**

The proof we give is due to Misiurewicz [1]. Recall that the topological entropy of a cover  $\mathcal{U}$  is  $H(\mathcal{U}) = \log N(\mathcal{U})$  and the entropy of a partition  $\alpha$  with respect to  $\mu$  is  $H_\mu(\alpha) = -\sum_{A \in \alpha} \mu(A) \log \mu(A)$ .

**PROOF OF (1).** Fix a finite Borel measurable partition  $\alpha = \{A_1, \dots, A_k\}$  for  $X$ . Given  $\epsilon > 0$ , say, we want to “improve” this partition by choosing a family of closed sets  $\hat{A}_1, \dots, \hat{A}_k$  such that

- (1)  $\hat{A}_i \subset A_i, i = 1, \dots, k$ , and
- (2)  $\mu(A_i - \hat{A}_i) < \epsilon$ ,

and then defining a new partition  $\hat{\alpha} = \{\hat{A}_1, \dots, \hat{A}_k, V\}$ , where  $V = X - (\cup_{i=1}^k \hat{A}_i)$ .

We can consider an open cover for  $X$  defined by

$$\mathcal{U} = \left\{ \hat{A}_1 \cup V, \dots, \hat{A}_k \cup V \right\}$$

If we compare the open covers  $\vee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i}\mathcal{U}$  and the partitions  $\vee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i}\hat{\alpha}$  then we see that

$$N(\vee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i}\hat{\alpha}) \leq 2^n N(\vee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i}\mathcal{U}), \quad n \geq 1 \tag{14.1}$$

(where we recall that  $N(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i} \mathcal{U})$  is the number of elements in a minimal subcover for  $\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i} \mathcal{U}$  and  $N(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i} \hat{\alpha})$  is the number of non-trivial elements in  $\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i} \hat{\alpha}$ ).

SUB-LEMMA 14.1.1.  $H_\mu(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i} \hat{\alpha}) \leq \log N(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i} \hat{\alpha})$ .

PROOF. Assume that  $\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i} \hat{\alpha} = \{C_1, \dots, C_N\}$ ; then we can write  $H_\mu(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i} \hat{\alpha}) = -\sum_{i=1}^N \mu(C_i) \log \mu(C_i)$ . ■

We can use Sub-lemma 14.7 to bound

$$\begin{aligned} & H_\mu(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i} \hat{\alpha}) \\ & \leq \log N(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i} \hat{\alpha}) \\ & \leq n \log 2 + \log N(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i} \mathcal{U}) \quad (\text{by (14.1)}). \end{aligned}$$

Recalling that

$$h(T) \geq h(T, \mathcal{U}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} H(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i} \mathcal{U})$$

and

$$h_\mu(T, \alpha) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} H_\mu(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i} \alpha)$$

we see that  $h_\mu(T, \hat{\alpha}) \leq \log 2 + h(T)$ . Moreover, by Corollary 8.6.1 we have that

$$\begin{aligned} |h_\mu(T, \hat{\alpha}) - h_\mu(T, \alpha)| & \leq H_\mu(\alpha | \hat{\alpha}) + H_\mu(\hat{\alpha} | \alpha) \\ & = -\sum_{C \in \alpha} \sum_{\hat{C} \in \hat{\alpha}} \mu(C \cap \hat{C}) \log \left( \frac{\mu(C \cap \hat{C})}{\mu(\hat{C})} \right) \\ & \quad - \sum_{C \in \alpha} \sum_{\hat{C} \in \hat{\alpha}} \mu(C \cap \hat{C}) \log \left( \frac{\mu(C \cap \hat{C})}{\mu(C)} \right) < 1, \end{aligned}$$

say, providing  $\epsilon$  was sufficiently small.

Since  $\alpha$  was arbitrary, we see that

$$h_\mu(T) = \sup\{h_\mu(T, \alpha) : \alpha \text{ is a finite partition}\} \leq h(T) + \log 2 + 1.$$

Finally, we can apply the argument to iterates  $T^k$  ( $k \geq 1$ ) to see that  $h_\mu(T^k) \leq h(T^k) + \log 2 + 1$ . By Corollary 3.8.1 we know that  $h(T^k) = kh(T)$ . The following gives the analogous result for measure theoretic entropy.

SUB-LEMMA 14.1.2 (ABRAMOV'S THEOREM). *For  $k \geq 1$ ,  $h_\mu(T^k) = kh_\mu(T)$ .*

PROOF. Given any partition  $\alpha$  we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} h_\mu(T^k, \bigvee_{i=0}^{k-1} T^{-i} \alpha) & = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} H_\mu(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-ik} (\bigvee_{j=0}^{k-1} T^{-j} \alpha)) \\ & = \lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{k}{N} H_\mu(\bigvee_{i=0}^{N-1} T^{-i} \alpha) = kh_\mu(T, \alpha). \end{aligned}$$

Given  $\epsilon > 0$  we can choose  $\alpha$  with  $h(T, \alpha) > h_\mu(T) - \epsilon$  so that we have

$$\begin{aligned} h_\mu(T^k) &\geq h_\mu(T^k, \bigvee_{i=0}^{k-1} T^{-i} \alpha) \\ &\geq kh_\mu(T, \alpha) \geq kh_\mu(T) - k\epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\epsilon > 0$  is arbitrary we see that  $h_\mu(T^k) \geq kh_\mu(T)$ .

To get the reverse inequality, notice that  $h_\mu(T^k, \alpha) \leq h_\mu(T^k, \bigvee_{i=0}^{k-1} T^{-i} \alpha)$ , using Lemma 8.6. Given  $\epsilon > 0$  we can choose  $\alpha$  with  $h_\mu(T^k, \alpha) > h_\mu(T^k) - \epsilon$  and then

$$\begin{aligned} kh_\mu(T) &\geq kh_\mu(T, \alpha) = h_\mu(T^k, \bigvee_{i=0}^{k-1} T^{-i} \alpha) \\ &\geq h_\mu(T^k, \alpha) > h_\mu(T^k) - \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\epsilon > 0$  is arbitrary we see that  $h_\mu(T^k) \leq kh_\mu(T)$ . ■

We can now complete the proof of (1) since

$$\begin{aligned} h_\mu(T) &= \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{h_\mu(T^k)}{k} \\ &\leq \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{h(T^k)}{k} + \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\log 2 + 1}{k} = h(T). \end{aligned}$$
■

PROOF OF (2). It suffices to show that given  $\delta > 0$  there exists a  $T$ -invariant probability measure  $\mu$  with  $h_\mu(T) \geq h(T) - \delta$ . We want to choose  $\epsilon > 0$  sufficiently small that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log(s(n, \epsilon)) \geq h(T) - \delta$ , where  $s(n, \epsilon)$  is the maximal cardinality of an  $(n, \epsilon)$ -separating set. We can find a sub-sequence  $n_i \rightarrow +\infty$  such that  $\frac{1}{n_i} \log(s(n_i, \epsilon)) = h(T)$ . Let  $S_{n_i}$  be such an  $(n_i, \epsilon)$ -separated set.

For each  $n_i$  we can define a (possibly non-invariant) probability measure

$$\nu_{n_i} = \frac{1}{s(n_i, \epsilon)} \sum_{x \in S_{n_i}} \delta_x.$$

In order to arrive at a  $T$ -invariant probability measure we can consider an accumulation point  $\mu$  (in the weak-star topology) of the measures

$$\mu_{n_i} = \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{r=0}^{n_i-1} (T^r)^* \nu_{n_i}.$$

By replacing  $\{n_i\}$  by a sub-sequence, if necessary, we can assume that  $\mu_{n_i} \rightarrow \mu$ .

Let want to consider a finite partition  $\alpha = \{A_1, \dots, A_k\}$  such that

- (1)  $\text{diam}(A_i) < \epsilon$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, k$ ; and
- (2)  $\mu(\partial A_i) = 0$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, k$ .

Since  $S_{n_i}$  is an  $(n_i, \epsilon)$ -separated set we know that each set  $C \in \alpha^{(n_i)} := \bigvee_{j=0}^{n_i-1} T^{-j} \alpha$  contains at most one point  $x = x_C \in S_{n_i}$ . Thus of the sets in  $S_{n_i}$  there are  $s(n_i, \epsilon)$  sets with  $\nu_{n_i}$ -measure  $\frac{1}{s(n_i, \epsilon)}$  and the remainder have  $\nu_{n_i}$ -measure zero. In particular, we see that

$$\log(s(n_i, \epsilon)) = - \sum_{C \in \alpha^{(n_i)}} \nu_{n_i}(C) \log \nu_{n_i}(C). \quad (14.2)$$

In order to take limits in a sensible way we fix first  $1 < N < n_i$  and then  $0 \leq j \leq N-1$ . We can write

$$\alpha^{(n_i)} = \bigvee_{i=0}^{n_i-1} T^{-i} \alpha = \left( \bigvee_{\substack{l=j \pmod{N} \\ 0 \leq l \leq n_i-N}} T^{-l} \left( \bigvee_{i=0}^{N-1} T^{-i} \alpha \right) \right) \vee \left( \bigvee_{i \in E} T^{-i} \alpha \right)$$

where  $E = \{0, 1, \dots, j-1\} \cup \{M_j, M_j+1, \dots, n_i-1\}$ , with  $M_j = N \lfloor \frac{n_i-j}{N} \rfloor$ , has cardinality at most  $2N$ .

**SUB-LEMMA 14.1.3.** *Given measurable partitions  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$  we have that*

$$H_{\nu_{n_i}}(\beta \vee \gamma) \leq H_{\nu_{n_i}}(\beta) + H_{\nu_{n_i}}(\gamma)$$

**PROOF.** For *invariant* measures, this would be an immediate consequence of Lemma 8.4 (and Corollary 8.4.1). However, although in chapter 8 we assumed that the ambient measures were invariant, this property was not used at this stage and the result remains true without it. ■

In particular, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & - \sum_{C \in \alpha^{(n_i)}} \nu_{n_i}(C) \log \nu_{n_i}(C) \\ & \leq \sum_{\substack{l=j \pmod{N} \\ 0 \leq l \leq N-n_i}} \left( - \sum_{C \in T^{-l} \alpha^{(N)}} \nu_{n_i}(C) \log \nu_{n_i}(C) \right) \\ & \quad + \sum_{i \in E} \left( - \sum_{C \in T^{-i} \alpha^{(N)}} \nu_{n_i}(C) \log \nu_{n_i}(C) \right) \\ & \leq \sum_{r=0}^{M_j} \left( - \sum_{D \in \alpha^{(N)}} (T^{rN+j})^* \nu_{n_i}(D) \log((T^{rN+j})^* \nu_{n_i}(D)) \right) \\ & \quad + 2N \log k \end{aligned} \quad (14.3)$$

(where for  $l = rN + j$  there is a natural correspondence between  $D \in \alpha^{(N)}$  and  $C \in T^{-l}\alpha^{(N)}$  with  $(T^l)^*\nu_{n_i}(D) := \nu_{n_i}(T^{-l}D) = \nu_{n_i}(C)$  and  $C = T^{-l}D$ ). Summing the inequalities (14.3) over  $j = 0, \dots, N - 1$  we have by (14.2)

$$\begin{aligned} & N \log(s(n_i, \epsilon)) \\ & \leq \sum_{l=0}^{n_i-1} \left( - \sum_{D \in \alpha^{(N)}} (T^l)^*\nu_{n_i}(D) \log((T^l)^*\nu_{n_i}(D)) \right) + 2N^2 \log k \end{aligned} \quad (14.4)$$

**SUB-LEMMA 14.1.4.** *Let  $\alpha$  be a measurable partition and let  $\nu_1$  and  $\nu_2$  be (not necessarily invariant) probability measures; then given  $0 \leq a \leq 1$  we have that*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{A \in \alpha} [a\nu_1 + (1-a)\nu_2](A) \log[a\nu_1 + (1-a)\nu_2](A) \\ & \leq a \left( \sum_{A \in \alpha} \nu_1(A) \log \nu_1(A) \right) + (1-a) \left( \sum_{A \in \alpha} \nu_2(A) \log \nu_2(A) \right). \end{aligned}$$

**PROOF.** This follows immediately since  $t \mapsto t \log t$  is convex. ■

Dividing (14.4) by  $n_i N$  we get that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n_i} \log(s(n_i, \epsilon)) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{r=0}^{n_i-1} \left( - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{D \in \alpha^{(N)}} (T^r)^*\nu_{n_i}(C) \log((T^r)^*\nu_{n_i}(C)) \right) + \frac{2N \log k}{n_i} \\ & \leq - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{C \in \alpha^{(N)}} \mu_{n_i}(C) \log \mu_{n_i}(C) + \frac{2N \log k}{n_i} \end{aligned}$$

where we have used Sub-lemma 14.1.4 repeatedly for the last line.

Since we have assumed  $\mu(\partial A_i) = 0$ , letting  $n_i \rightarrow +\infty$  (with  $N$  fixed) we have that

$$- \sum_{C \in \alpha^{(N)}} \mu_{n_i}(C) \log \mu_{n_i}(C) \rightarrow H_\mu(\alpha^{(N)}).$$

This means that

$$\begin{aligned} h(T) - \delta & \leq \lim_{n_i \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n_i} \log(s(n_i, \epsilon)) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{N} H_\mu(\alpha^{(N)}) + \lim_{n_i \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{2N^2 \log k}{n_i} \\ & = \frac{1}{N} H_\mu(\alpha^{(N)}). \end{aligned}$$

Letting  $N \rightarrow +\infty$  we have that

$$h(T) - \delta \leq \lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{N} H_\mu(\alpha^{(N)}) = h_\mu(\alpha) \leq h_\mu(T).$$

Since  $\delta > 0$  is arbitrary this completes the proof. ■

### 14.3 Comments and reference

The proof we give is due to Misiurewicz [1]. Theorem 14.1 (1) was originally due to Goodman. Theorem 14.1 (2) was subsequently proved by Walters.

#### References

1. M. Misiurewicz, *A short proof of the variational principle for a  $\mathbb{Z}_+^N$  action on a compact space*, Astérisque **40** (1976), 147-187.